

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on July 19, 2005, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 1, 3, 15, 29, 32, 33, 37, and 42 are amended, claims 2, 19, 26, 28, and 30-31 are canceled, and no claims are added; as a result, claims 1, 3-18, 20-25, 27, 29, and 32-42 are now pending in this application.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant respectfully requests that a copy of the 1449 Form, listing all references that were submitted with the Information Disclosure Statement filed on February 12, 2005 marked as being considered and initialled by the Examiner, be returned with the next official communication.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-4, 9-10, 12, 15-18, 20, 32, and 42 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kato, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,439,708) in view of Wen (U.S. Patent No. 6,428,157).

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 15, 29, 32, 37, and 42 to more clearly recite patentable subject matter and not in view of references cited by the Examiner. Applicant's independent claim 1, as amended, recites, besides other things:

an overcoat printhead for depositing drops of an overcoat onto the deposited drops of the colored ink, wherein the fixer and overcoat printheads are half-height relative to the at least one ink printhead, and wherein each printhead includes a number of ink ejection elements and wherein the ink ejection elements of each printhead are divided into groups; and

a processor programmed to:

generate swath data for the at least one ink printhead, the fixer printhead, and the overcoat printhead;

generate null swath data for at least two groups of ink printhead ink ejection elements; and

generate null swath data for at least two groups of fixer and overcoat printhead ink ejection elements.

Applicant's independent claim 15, as amended, recites, besides other things:

wherein each printhead includes a number of ink ejection elements and

wherein the ink ejection elements of each printhead are divided into groups;
and. . .
a processor programmed to:
. . . generate null swath data for at least two groups of ink printhead ink
ejection elements; and
generate null swath data for at least two groups of fixer and overcoat
printhead ink ejection elements.

Applicant's independent claim 32, as amended, recites, besides other things:

wherein each printhead includes a number of ink ejection elements and
wherein the ink ejection elements of each printhead are divided into groups;
. . . instructions encoded in the memory to cause the processor to:
. . . generate null swath data for at least two groups of ink
printhead ink ejection elements; and
generate null swath data for at least two groups of fixer and
overcoat printhead ink ejection elements.

Applicant's independent claim 37, as amended, recites, besides other things:

wherein each printhead includes a number of ink ejection elements and
wherein the ink ejection elements of each printhead are divided into groups; and
wherein null swath data is generated for at least two groups of ink
printhead ink ejection elements; and
wherein null swath data is generated for at least two groups of fixer and
overcoat printhead ink ejection elements

And, Applicant's independent claim 42, as amended, recites, besides other
things:

wherein each printhead includes a number of ink ejection elements
and wherein the ink ejection elements of each printhead are divided into
groups;
. . . wherein null swath data is generated for at least two groups of ink
printhead ink ejection elements; and
wherein null swath data is generated for at least two groups of fixer and
overcoat printhead ink ejection elements.

From a review of the Kato, et al. reference, the Applicant was unable to locate a
teaching or suggestion of the above referenced elements.

The Wen reference fails to cure the deficiencies of the Kato, et al.
reference. The Wen reference appears to describe an apparatus for depositing
ink and a polymer protective coating after ink has been applied.

Neither the Kato, et al. reference nor the Wen reference, either alone or in combination, appear to teach or suggest the above stated elements, as recited by Applicant's independent claims 1, 15, 32, 37, and 42.

As such, each and every element and limitation is not provided in the references, either independently or in combination, to support a §103 rejection of claims 1, 15, 32, 37, and 42. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 15, 32, 37, and 42 as well as the rejections of the claims that depend therefrom.

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kato, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,439,708) in view of Wen (U.S. Patent No. 6,428,157) as applied to claim 1 in view of Otsuki (U.S. Patent No. 6,145,961). Since claim 13 depends from allowable claim 1, claim 13 is deemed allowable. As such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103 rejection of claim 13.

Claims 5-6 and 14 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kato, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,439,708) in view of Wen (U.S. Patent No. 6,428,157) as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Moriyama, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,412,934). Since claims 5-6 and 14 depend from allowable claim 1, claims 5-6, and 14 are deemed allowable. As such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103 rejection of claims 5-6, and 14.

Claims 33, 37, 39, and 40 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kato, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,439,708) in view of Wen (U.S. Patent No. 6,428,157) and Kato, et al. (U.S. 6,102,537).

Applicant has amended independent claims 33 and 37 to more clearly recite patentable subject matter and not in view of references cited by the Examiner. Applicant's independent claim 33, as amended, recites, besides other things:

 sending swath data to the ink printheads, during a first pass, the swath data causing the ink printheads to deposit ink on the medium during the first pass; and
 sending swath data to the fixer and overcoat printheads during a second pass, the swath data causing the ink printheads to deposit ink on the fixer and the overcoat during the second pass, wherein the fixer and overcoat printheads are half-height relative to the at least one ink printhead, and advancing the print medium by a distance half-height of the full-height ink printhead; and
 wherein each printhead includes a number of ink ejection elements and wherein the ink ejection elements of each printhead are divided into groups; and

wherein null swath data is generated for at least two groups of ink printhead ink ejection elements; and

wherein null swath data is generated for at least two groups of fixer and overcoat printhead ink ejection elements.

And, Applicant's independent claim 37, as amended, recites, besides other things:

the drops of fixer and the drops of overcoat deposited from a fixer printhead and an overcoat printhead which are half-height relative to a printhead depositing the drops of colored ink onto the medium; and

wherein each printhead includes a number of ink ejection elements and wherein the ink ejection elements of each printhead are divided into groups; and

wherein null swath data is generated for at least two groups of ink printhead ink ejection elements; and

wherein null swath data is generated for at least two groups of fixer and overcoat printhead ink ejection elements

From a review of the Kato, et al. reference, Applicant was unable to locate a teaching or suggestion of the above referenced elements.

The Wen reference fails to cure the deficiencies of the Kato, et al. reference. The Wen reference appears to describe an apparatus for depositing ink and a polymer protective coating after ink has been applied. Neither the Kato, et al. reference nor the Wen reference, either alone or in combination, appear to teach or suggest the above stated elements, as recited by Applicant's independent claims 33 and 37. As such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103 rejection of claim 37, as well as the rejections of the claims that depend therefrom.

Regarding claims 39 and 40, since claims 39 and 40 depend from allowable claim 37, claims 39 and 40 are deemed allowable. As such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103 rejection of claims 39 and 40.

Claim 34 was rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kato, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,439,708) in view of Wen (U.S. Patent No. 6,428,157) and Kato, et al (6,102,537), as applied to claim 33, and further in view of Allen (U.S. Patent No. (5,635,969). Since claim 34 depends from allowable claim 32, claim 34 is deemed allowable. As such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103 rejection of claim 34.

Claims 35, 38, and 41 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kato, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,439,708) in view of Wen (U.S.

Patent No. 6,428,157) and Kato, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,102,537) as applied to claims 33 and 37, and further in view of Moriyama, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,412,934). Since claim 35 depends from allowable claim 33; and claims 38 and 41 depend from allowable claim 37, Applicant submits that claims 35, 38, and 41 are deemed allowable. As such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103 rejection of claims 35, 38, and 41.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant appreciates the allowance of claims 21-25, 27, and 29.

Claims 7, 8, and 36 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating allowable subject matter in claims 7, 8, and 36.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney Larry D. Baker at (360) 212-0769 to facilitate prosecution of this matter.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to the Deposit Account No. 08-2025.



CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR §1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: MS AMENDMENT Commissioner for Patents, P.O. BOX 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 17th day of October, 2005.

Sarah L. Reinhard
Name

Sarah L. Reinhard
Signature

Respectfully Submitted,
Brooke Smith, et al.

By their Representatives,
BROOKS & CAMERON, PLLC
1221 Nicollet Avenue, Suite 500
Minneapolis, MN 55403

By: [Signature]
Jeffery L. Cameron
Reg. No. 43,527

Date: 10/17/05